

June 9, 1980

Approved For Release 1985/07/12 : CIA-RDP85-00988R000200110024-3

H 4621

amendments proposed by the Interior Department and we have no objection to them.

The 18th amendment provides that a small tract of Federal land in Thurston County, Wash., held by the United States in trust for a private Indian school incorporated under the laws of the State.

While I feel that the use of these Federal lands for the purposes of this Indian school is desirable, I could not support a transfer of the lands in trust to the school. The trust relationship extends either to federally-recognized Indian tribes or members of such tribes.

Holding lands in trust for a school or other person or entity not an Indian tribe or member of such tribe would set a precedent I am not prepared to support.

I propose to amend Senate amendment 18 to provide simply that the Secretary of the Interior would hold these lands for the use of the school as long as it is used for school purposes. No trust transfer would be involved.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona to dispense with the reading of the amendments?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the amendments just considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

PERTAINING TO INHERITANCE OF TRUST OR RESTRICTED LAND ON THE STANDING ROCK SIOUX RESERVATION, NORTH DAKOTA AND SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2102) pertaining to the inheritance of trust or restricted land on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, North Dakota and South Dakota, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "devise" and insert "distribution".

Page 2, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert:

"Sec. 2. Only the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North Dakota and South Dakota (hereinafter the "tribe") or persons who are (a) enrolled members of the tribe, (b) members of a federally recognized Indian tribe, or (c) otherwise recognized as In-

dians by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter the "Secretary") shall be entitled to receive by".

Page 2, line 11, strike out "leaving" and insert "possessed of".

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "an approved will" and insert "a will approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 856), as amended (25 U.S.C. 373) and which is".

Page 3, line 8, strike out "parents" and insert "surviving parents or parent".

Page 3, line 9, strike out "parents," and insert "parent".

Page 3, line 12, strike out "parents," and insert parent".

Page 3, strike out lines 18, 19, and 20 and insert:

(c) As used in this section, the words "children" and "issue" include adopted children and children of unwed parents where the Secretary determines that paternity has been acknowledged or established, except that (1) a child may not inherit by intestate succession from or through a parent whose parental rights with respect to said child have been terminated pursuant to lawful authority and (2) a parent may not inherit by intestate succession from or through a child with respect to which such parent's parental rights have been so terminated.

Page 3, line 23, strike out "leaves" and insert "dies possessed of".

Page 4, line 2, after "lifetime" insert ", but the remainder of such interest shall descend as provided in section 3 of this Act".

Page 4, line 11, after "Secretary" insert "as of the date of the decedent's death".

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman for an explanation.

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2102, as passed by the House, provides for the modification of certain Federal laws regulating the devise and descent of interests in trust or restricted lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation in North and South Dakota. The bill was supported by all concerned parties and passed by unanimous consent.

The Senate recently passed the bill with numerous amendments. These amendments are all technical or clarifying in nature and were recommended by the Department of the Interior in its report to the Senate committee.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona to dispense with the reading?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XXVII, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are

ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Tuesday, June 10, 1980.

EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ON OFFICIAL TRAVEL

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7072) to amend sections 5702 and 5704 of title 5, United States Code, to increase the maximum rates for per diem and actual subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of Government employees on official travel, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7072

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5702 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$35" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50";

(2) by striking out "\$50" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$75"; and

(3) by striking out "\$21" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$33".

Sec. 2. Section 5704 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "11 cents" in subsection (a)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "20 cents";

(2) by striking out "20 cents" in subsection (a)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "25 cents"; and

(3) by striking out "24 cents" in subsection (a)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "46 cents".

Sec. 3. To make available to Congress information in order that it may evaluate and reduce excessive per diem and mileage allowance payments:

(a) The Administrator of General Services shall, based upon a sampling survey, collect by fiscal year the following information (compiled separately for payments made under sections 5702 and 5704 of title 5, United States Code, and for each agency evaluated) with respect to agencies spending more than \$5,000,000 annually on transportation of people:

(1) Identification of the general causes and purposes of travel, both foreign and domestic, estimates of total payments, average cost and duration of trip, and an explanation of how these estimates were determined; and

(2) Identification by specific agency of travel practices which appear to be inefficient from a travel management or program management standpoint and recommendations to the Congress on the applicability of alternatives to travel as well as other techniques to improve the use of travel in carrying out program objectives by relating travel to mission.

(b) (1) The Administrator shall report the information required by subsection (a) to the Congress for fiscal year 1979 by February 1, 1981; for fiscal year 1980 by June 1, 1981; and for fiscal year 1981 by June 1, 1982.

(2) The Administrator is empowered to issue such rules and regulations as are necessary to ensure that the information is submitted by the various agencies to him in a manner that permits comparisons among the agencies and to permit him to compile the information required to be included in the annual report.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from California (Mr.

JOHN L. BURTON) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHN L. BURTON).

1230

MR. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. JOHN L BURTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7072 provides for the first increase in 5 years in the maximum per diem, subsistence, and mileage allowances paid to Federal employees while on official travel. It does not authorize the enactment of any additional appropriations or for any new budget authority. It will not result in any additional cost to the Government. The Office of Management and Budget has already directed agencies to absorb any increased costs by reducing the amount of official travel or by reducing administrative costs. OMB will not permit any agency to seek supplemental or additional appropriations.

The current maximum travel allowances were established in 1975. The actual cost of travel has increased by over 30 percent, largely because of increases in the cost of energy. Often, these allowances do not adequately reimburse employees for the costs that they incur while on official travel and they are forced to subsidize Government travel out of their salaries.

H.R. 7072 increases the maximum per diem reimbursement from \$35 to \$50 per day, the maximum actual expense reimbursement for high cost areas from \$50 to \$75 per day, and the overseas rate from \$21 to \$33. Maximum mileage allowances paid to employees using privately owned vehicles on Government business is increased from 20 to 25 cents for automobiles, from 11 to 20 cents for motorcycles, and from 25 to 45 cents for airplanes. Under H.R. 7072 the General Services Administration could establish reimbursement rates which reflect its cost determinations, so long as they did not exceed the maximum rates.

In addition, this legislation requires the GSA to provide three annual reports to the Congress on an agency-by-agency basis with information about how much is being spent on Federal travel, and ways that amount can be reduced.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is needed both to provide fair compensation to Federal employess who must travel on Government business, and to provide information about travel expenditures to the Congress in order to evaluate future travel reimbursement proposals and insure that expenditures are made only for necessary Government travel. H.R. 7072 received unanimous approval in the Committee on Government Operations, and I urge your favorable consideration.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7072. As the ranking minority member of the Government

Activities and Transportation Subcommittee, I worked closely with Chairman BURTON to iron out problems faced with this bill.

The most significant concern I had at the outset was the potential impact of the bill on the appropriations process. There is no question that an increase in the per diem and mileage rates will increase travel expenditures, but subcommittee members were determined that this bill would not impact the budget. Therefore, we requested and received a commitment from the administration, represented by the Office of Management and Budget, that passage of H.R. 7072 will not result in increased or supplemental appropriations. In addition, the OMB has already notified the agencies that expected increased travel costs are to be absorbed.

During our deliberations of H.R. 7072, we discovered that there is a general lack of information on Government travel expenditures. We were told time and time again during the hearings that our questions cannot be answered because no records on Government travel information are kept centrally. In other words, no one in the Government is aware of how much money is spent on travel, how many trips are taken or to where. Our greatest frustration was in trying to calculate how much money we are requiring the agencies to absorb in order to increase the per diem and mileage rates. As a result of this discovery, we amended the bill in subcommittee to include a requirement that GSA collect Government travel costs information for the next 3 years to give us some idea of travel trends. Following compilation of this information, it will be an easier task for Congress to assess travel costs the next time it is necessary to adjust the rates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7072. We should not allow a situation to exist where Federal employees are having to cover legitimate business expenses out of their own pockets.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

(Mr. GRASSLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I would ask the gentleman in the committee deliberations of this bill was there any consideration given to the General Accounting Office reports and studies that have been issued in the last 2 years as to the excessive amount of travel by Federal employees? I remember reading one figure, in fact I think we used it in debate on the first budget resolution a year ago, in which on any one day there are 22,000 Federal employees actually traveling by air. That is in 1 day. The General Accounting Office was inferring tremendous waste in such travel.

Has that been considered by the committee?

Mr. WALKER. I can assure the gentleman that it was considered by the committee. We were assured that the ad-

ministration has taken steps to implement some reforms based upon that particular study and, in fact, has already cut about \$500 million in costs from travel in this fiscal year.

In addition, there will have to be additional costs absorbed that will take a lot of the unreasonable, irresponsible travel out because we are talking here about a cost which could cut as much as a third of Federal travel under the provisions of this bill, with the costs being absorbed. That is a concern that I expressed throughout the committee deliberations, and I think it is addressed in this. That is another reason why we think there is a need for central recordkeeping of just what Government travel goes on. The bill addresses that by saying that for the first time we are going to have the travel data collected from all agencies of Government, kept centrally so we know exactly how much travel is going on, where the travel is, how much it is costing. This will be the first time we have those kinds of statistics to work with. I think it is going to make it far easier to monitor Government travel in the future as the result of passage of this bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I am glad the committee did take those things into consideration because I know they were concerns that have been expressed for this budget year we are now in. I am glad the committee followed up on that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the members of the subcommittee on their work in attempting to unravel the complicated issue of travel by Federal employees. I would like to emphasize the importance of OMB's decision to not allocate any new funds for Federal travel if the per diem and mileage allowances are increased. OMB must not waver on this important point. In this era of rampant inflation and increasing unemployment, the U.S. Congress must not tolerate more Federal dollars to be wasted on unnecessary travel.

Our efforts to balance the Federal budget and constrict the money supply are being undermined by an expenditure of almost \$3 billion in fiscal year 1979 for travel for Federal employees. This \$3 billion was spent on travel for the Federal Government's 2 million full-time employees. This equals a travel allowance of \$1,500 for each Federal employee—including secretaries, computer operators, janitors, and maintenance personnel. This is intolerable.

For that reason, I applaud OMB for issuing a directive requiring travel expenditures by Federal employees to remain at the same level if this bill becomes law. OMB should not misinterpret congressional intent—we do not want any more money spent on Federal travel if the per diem and mileage allowances are increased. I, and many of my colleagues, could not support a per diem and mileage allowance increase unless OMB holds the lid on appropriations.

Three billion dollars of the taxpayers' funds spent on Federal travel is an inexcusable waste. I urge the members of the subcommittee to continue their important work in eliminating most administrative travel for Federal employees and making necessary program travel

June 9, 1980

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE
Approved For Release 2005/07/12 : CIA-RDP85-00988R000200110024-3

H 4623

Mr. SPEAKER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time and yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHN L. BURTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7072, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 7072, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5997) to provide for the distribution of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5997

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, each agency shall display in appropriate areas of Federal buildings copies of the Code of Ethics for Government Service.

Sec. 2. (a) The Administrator shall provide for the publication of copies of such Code of Ethics and for their distribution to agencies for use under the first section of this Act.

(b) The Administrator may accept on behalf of the United States any unconditional gift made for purposes of this Act.

Sec. 3. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "agency" means an Executive agency (as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code), the United States Postal Service, and the Postal Rate Commission;

(2) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the General Services Administration;

(3) the term "Code of Ethics for Government Service" means the code of ethics set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 175, agreed to July 11, 1958 (72 Stat. B12); and

(4) the term "Federal building" means any building in which at least 20 individuals are regularly employed by an agency as civilian employees.

Sec. 4. The provisions of this Act shall take effect October 1, 1980.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) will be

ore cost-effective. We owe our overexposed constituents no less.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Beaumont, Tex., the honorable JACK BROOKS.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply tries to ensure that Government workers will be treated in a fair and equitable manner when they travel on official Government business.

It has been 5 years since there was any change in the per diem rate for official travel, and no one here needs to be reminded what has happened to restaurant and hotel prices during that time. The \$35 a day now authorized for Government travel does not come close to covering the actual expenses most employees must meet. It is obviously unfair to those employees to expect them to subsidize the Government by paying the extra charges out of their own pockets.

It should be made absolutely clear that this bill does not authorize one mile of travel or one dollar of travel expense. Government agencies must justify their travel expenses and have them funded by the Appropriations Committee, just as they always have. With the tight budgets the agencies are now operating on, a raise in the per diem rate could well have the effect of reducing Government travel by eliminating all but the most essential.

But that is a separate issue. It has nothing to do with this bill. H.R. 7072 is simply a recognition of the reality of what it now costs to travel.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, accepting the word of the administration that the additional cost of this legislation will be absorbed by the agencies without the need for any additional appropriation, we are led to the conclusion that the practical effect of the bill is to reduce bureaucratic travel.

In approving this legislation we should urge the Committee on Government Operations to vigorously carry out its intent to evaluate and discipline excessive travel.

The Office of Management and Budget presents figures that show administrative travel in the executive branch for fiscal 1980 would be about \$180 million and programmatic travel would be about \$2.84 billion. Under the provisions of Public Law 96-86, which reduced the amount of funds available for all governmental travel, OMB projects a reduction of \$500 million.

For too long the bureaucratic travel of the executive branch has been handled too loosely. Reliable data is hard to come by.

As one who is not adverse to legitimate and justifiable official travel in the interest of good Government, I see no reason why executive branch travel should not be subject to the same scrutiny and standards as congressional travel.

Therefore I hope we can expect some periodic reports on whether or not extravagances are being eliminated.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN).

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHN L. BURTON) a specific question on this bill. We have raised the mileage reimbursement from 20 cents to 25 cents a mile for private automobiles. For some time my staff and I back in Kansas have been computing what the actual costs are to drive, and we discussed it this morning. There is some concern that this will cost the Government several hundred million dollars more down the line and some, maybe many Federal employees might be making some money on 25 cents a mile. I would like to ask the gentleman what was the rationale for going up a nickel a mile, and if their data indicate it does, in fact, cost that much per mile.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1240

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. There is no indication it costs that much. It does not go up a nickel a mile. It is average costs up to 25 cents a mile. So I mean if it only costs 7 cents a mile as an average of actual costs set by GSA, the employee only gets that kind of reimbursement; so it is average expenses up to. There was a Government study that the present cost of mileage now, not only gasoline, wear and tear on the car, tire depreciation, et cetera, is 21.5 cents a mile, and, in addition, that utilization of the automobile would encourage them to use this means of travel possibly other than using more expensive ways such as air travel. Again, the bill provides a maximum reimbursable amount, but the actual allowance is a weighted average mileage rate, which can be up to 25 cents a mile. You do not get an automatic 25 cents a mile.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Is it not true, however, that most Federal employees who use an automobile do in fact seek reimbursement for that mileage charge of 20 or 25 cents a mile?

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. No. It is set at different costs up to the maximum, based on agency-by-agency experience.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Naturally, we want to keep the amount of travel down. I just do not want to see anybody unjustly enriched.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Nobody would be unjustly enriched. The gentleman has my commitment on that.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's commitment. If anybody can give me one, it is he.

recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5997 requires that copies of the Code of Ethics for Government Service be posted and displayed in buildings housing 20 or more Federal employees. As you know, the Code of Ethics for Government Service was adopted as a concurrent resolution during the 85th Congress in 1958. The Code articulates 10 precepts which apply to any person in Government service. Among the principles of the Code are:

Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.

Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay.

Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.

Expose corruption wherever discovered.

Unfortunately, knowledge of the Code of Ethics in the Federal work force has declined to a sad level. The Code itself is no longer printed by the Government Printing Office, the plates have been destroyed, and copies are scarce. This state of affairs is deplorable indeed: The words of the Code of Ethics are as important today as when originally passed. Now, perhaps more than ever, there exists a strong need to keep ethical values vital.

H.R. 5997 was reported out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in an attempt to restore the Code of Ethics for Government Service to its proper place of prominence. We cannot say that posting a copy of the Code of Ethics for Government Service will instantly upgrade the ethical standards of those employees who walk by. What we can say is that a clear and present reminder of ethical duties will have some effect over the long run.

Before I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ethics, who wrote this legislation, I would like to say a word about the cost. Printing, framing or laminating, distributing, and hanging copies of the Code will cost some money. The General Services Administration thought \$200,000 was an accurate estimate. I think that this is a small sum to pay for the real and potential benefits which display of the Code can bring.

Nevertheless, a private, nonprofit, educational group has offered to provide 200,000 printed and laminated copies of the Code, suitable for hanging. Two hundred thousand copies is more than enough to meet the purposes of the legislation. Further, the bill expressly provides for the acceptance of gifts to carry out the program. So, it is probable that the entire program envisioned in H.R. 5997 can be carried out without recourse to the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I really want to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) who has been my chairman on another committee. He has worked very, very hard on this legislation, and this was basically one of his ideas. I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) who is responsible both for this legislation and for the passage of the original Code of Ethics.

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the committee, the subcommittee under the able leadership of the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER), and the full committee for bringing this bill out.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5997 which I introduced to provide for the distribution of the Code of Ethics for Government Service. I authored the Code of Ethics for Government Service some 20 years ago and it was approved by Congress in 1958. The 10 general principles of the code enunciate a standard of behavior that should be the guideline for all persons employed by the Federal Government.

The relevance and need for such a code are as apparent today as when it was first proposed. Federal employees must be encouraged and directed to strive to meet their job responsibilities in the most efficient, productive, and honest manner. The code lays out just what is expected of those employed in Government service.

We all need frequent reminders of the goals, standards, and responsibilities that are part of our employment. For Federal employees, the Code of Ethics can serve as a reference point of just what is required of those whose job it is to serve the public. To accomplish that purpose, it is essential that the code be prominently displayed in Federal offices. My bill aims to insure that the General Services Administration, in conjunction with the executive agencies, will undertake a program to provide for the open display of the Code of Ethics in appropriate locations in all Federal offices. The bill allows the Government to accept unconditional gifts from private donors to help meet the cost of publishing and displaying the Code, and a private foundation (American Viewpoint, Inc.) plans to help in this effort. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5997 which will provide for the distribution of the Code of Ethics for Government Service.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT). I would just like to remind the Members that a private, nonprofit educational group has offered to provide 200,000 printed and laminated copies of the Code suitable for hanging. Two hundred thousand copies are more than enough to meet the purposes of this legislation. Furthermore, the bill expressly provides for the acceptance of gifts to carry out the program, so it is probable the entire program envisioned in H.R. 5997 can be carried out without recourse to the taxpayers' money.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Is it correct that there has been an offer by this private group, American Viewpoint, Inc. and Mr. Ivan Hill to absorb the complete costs of the printing of 200,000 copies of the Code of Ethics? Is that correct?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is correct, for the printing costs. That is my understanding, yes.

Mr. BAUMAN. There will be some cost of distribution.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. The American Viewpoint wrote the committee on this matter, and I will quote from the letter. This is a letter from Ivan Hill. He is the president of American Viewpoint.

I confirm to you directly that our organization will provide at no cost to the United States Government 200,000 full-color copies of the Code of Ethics for Government Service.

They are going to provide those. The small cost that would be involved would be for pushing a thumbtack into the wall. They are laminated copies and do not require framing. That small cost would be the Government cost because there is no real way to handle that. But the material itself would be furnished free.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentlewoman. I just want to say I think it is a commendable arrangement. If, indeed, it would cost the taxpayers anything, I would raise some questions because, while it is laudable to have the Code of Ethics in a place where all members of Federal employment can read them, I am not sure how much impact it will have, particularly if it is put in places where Federal employees are, such as in a lunchroom where they might be more intent on eating a hamburger than considering ethics. But the gentlewoman has been an advocate of exempting Congress from matters pertaining to the executive branch. Is there any consideration to putting the Code of Ethics on the bathroom door of each Member of Congress so they would be sure to see it? What is good for Federal employees ought to be good for us.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman makes an excellent point. Unfortunately, it is not in my subcommittee's jurisdiction, but the gentleman may wish to introduce such legislation. I think this is very important. I think it a tragedy that the Government Printing Office is not printing the Code of Ethics any more for Federal employees. That is really rather shocking. I think that Federal employees are basically very good people. It certainly would not hurt to remind them of the Code. I think they would probably look up from their hamburgers at least